



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DELITZSCH'S SUMERIAN GRAMMAR

BY J. DYNELEY PRINCE

Columbia University

Professor Delitzsch at great self-sacrifice interrupted his special Sumerological investigations in order to prepare the present work,¹ because he regarded this task as a necessary service to Sumerology. It must be many years before a complete and satisfactory analysis can be made of all the existing Sumerian material, and, recognizing this fact, the author decided to present to scholars at least the foundation of a Sumerian grammar. He has deliberately made no references to conclusions regarding the phenomena of the grammar arrived at by other specialists, believing it best for science in general that each Sumerologist should investigate this idiom independently. At some time in the future, a final and correct collation may be made of such individual labors, which shall place the science of Sumerian philology on a firm and unchanging basis. He states (Preface, p. vi) that he was forced to this decision by observing the differences between many of his own conclusions and those of so admirable an authority as Thureau-Dangin. Delitzsch makes no allusion to Langdon's *Sumerian Grammar*, which preceded the present work by three years.

The author, after conscientiously giving all his citations in a list (pp. ix-xxii) of texts from the British Museum and the Berlin Museum, explains his system of transliteration (pp. xxiii-xxv). In the Introduction (pp. 1-6), he explains (pp. 1-2) that the term "Sumerian" was used of the non-Semitic idiom, while "Akkadian" was the exclusive designation of the Semitic Babylonian. This point had already been satisfactorily demonstrated by Langdon, §§ 2, 3, who quotes from an Ašurbanipal inscription, in which

¹ *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*. By Friedrich Delitzsch. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914. 158 + xxv pp. M. 17.50.

The following abbreviations have been used in this paper: *MSL* = J. D. Prince, *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon*, Leipzig, 1908; Langdon = S. H. Langdon, *Sumerian Grammar and Chrestomathy*, Paris, 1911; *JA* = *Journal Asiatique*; Br. = Brünnow, "Sign-list"; R = Rawlinson, *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*; HT = Paul Haupt, *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte*.

akkadû is used unequivocally for the Semitic idiom. Delitzsch (p. 1, n. 11) believes that the name Sumer was Semitic and denoted southern and middle Babylonia. I cannot agree with this view, as a genuine phonetic connection between *kengi(n) = ki(n)-ki(n)*, 'the lands *par excellence*,' and šumer seems perfectly possible (Prince in *AJSL*, XXVIII, 67). Delitzsch also very properly calls attention (p. 3) to the frequent incongruities between the Sumerian originals and the Semitic translations in bilingual texts. It has long been known that many of these Semitic variations were caused by the effort on the part of the scribe to avoid in Semitic the monotonous tautology of the Sumerian. It has also become apparent that the Semitic translators often really did not understand the Sumerian texts which they were endeavoring to render. This fact has been for years a stumbling-block in the way of a correct appreciation of Sumerian grammar. Delitzsch recognizes fully that the Semitic translations are too often misleading. As the Sumerian became more and more a written "sacred" language, it naturally, like the Latin of the Middle Ages, was influenced more and more by the vernacular, so that, especially in the later texts, traces of unconscious Semitism become very evident. Delitzsch is, therefore, quite right in choosing the unilingual Sumerian material as the only trustworthy norm for his grammatical work. It seems strange, however, that he lays little or no stress on the great importance played by paronomastic association in the formation of the Sumerian syllabary (cf. *MSL*, Introduction).

In the chapter on "Phonetics" (p. 14) allusion is made to the occurrence of a great number of words in Sumerian, apparently identical in sound but widely different in meaning, many of which varying significations must have been distinguished from one another in speech. Their great divergence in sense precludes the possibility of their having been pronounced alike. He hints at the probability of there having been "spoken vocalic *nuances*" which were incapable of representation in the written language, but says nothing about the likelihood that the Sumerians used tones in much the same manner as the modern Chinese. In fact, only once in this work does the author use the word "tone" (p. 74, § 113), where he suggests that the imperative particle *bara* was possibly pronounced "im Befehls-

ton" to distinguish it from the finite *bara*, 'away' = German: 'aus-, hinweg'; Russian: 'u-, ot-, ' etc. There were certainly tones in the case of *bara*, as *bara* = the imperative particle, the particle of removal, and also *bara* = 'he to him' (see below). In my *MSL* I have alluded to the necessity of supposing that tones existed in spoken Sumerian, but so numerous are the meanings attributed to many individual phonetic values that the tone-theory is in itself not sufficient to explain all the variations. The different meanings attached to a syllable often exceed the possible or, at any rate, the probable number of tones, and, moreover, the simple syllables, as Delitzsch points out, are often abbreviations of longer originals, a phenomenon which would tend to change the *quantity* rather than the *tone*. Unhappily, we know as yet next to nothing about the quantity of Sumerian vowels.

Delitzsch alludes (p. 14) to *aš*, 'one,' and *aš*, 'six,' as one striking example of this phenomenon. There are seven meanings in Delitzsch's *Glossar* for the syllable *aš*; viz., 'one'; 'erect'; 'man' (?); probably this last *aš* is a rhotacism for *ru* (*ur*); in the combination *aš-bulug*, 'hasten very much' ($a = ID + š = KU$); 'desire'; 'curse'; and 'six.' Even so brief a list of meanings as this does not lend itself to satisfactory analysis because there are so many elements of possible difference which do not depend either on vowel shading or tone. Thus, *aš*, 'man' ($= ru, ur ?$), and *aš*, 'six' ($= ia, 'five' + aš, 'one'$), leave us in doubt as to whether these so-called *aš*-values were all really pronounced *aš*. We note that *aš*, *eš*, *uš* all mean 'man,' just as *laš* and *luš* = 'wash' and *gad* and *gud* = 'be bright,' as well as many similar cases. Possibly some of the vowels in spoken Sumerian were obscure and indeterminate, for example, like the Roumanian *ă*, or perhaps Roumanian *î*. Such a theory may serve as a key to many of the variant meanings often attached to the same syllable (see below).

Tones probably came into play in connection with the three meanings associated with *aš*, 'one'; i.e., 'one'; 'perfect'; and 'agree'; and also with *aš*, 'erect, stretch,' *aš* in *aš-bulug*; *aš*, 'desire' and 'curse.' These two latter meanings were in all probability distinct tonally; cf. in Mandarin Chinese the three tones of the syllable *mo*; *mo* (1), 'feel, touch'; *mo* (2), 'grind, rub'; *mo* (3), 'rub out, obliterate.'

Here there are certainly three tones used to indicate distinctions of the same basic idea, while a fourth *mo* (4) = 'afterward, at last.'

Another very interesting point in this connection is the evident use of many verbs in Sumerian in both a transitive and intransitive sense (§ 114) without any formative particle. In such cases, it is highly likely that tones played a part, as *e* = 'go out' and 'drive out'; *tu* = 'enter' and 'bring in,' etc. Compare my remarks, *MSL*, pp. viii and xxi, on the purely grammatical tones of the African Yoruba language.

In § 18 Delitzsch's forms *me* = *ma-e*, 'I'; *ze-me*, 'thou art,' for *za-e-me* rather tend to prove the thesis that *ma-e*, *za-e*, 'I, thou,' stood for *mō*, *zō* and not *mö*, *zö*, as Langdon thought.

On p. 17, Delitzsch calls attention to the singular fact that *šag* (*ša-a*), 'be friendly,' has a gloss *sa-a*, and that *šam* also shows a gloss *sa-a*. The *š* and *s* in Sumerian were usually very carefully kept apart. This *sa-a* = *šag* = *d a m â q u* was probably originally *si(g)-a* = *sig* = *d a m â q u*, but this still shows the interchange of *š* and *s*, which excites Delitzsch's surprise. This change, *š* to *s*, really does occur occasionally, as *r* = *s* and *š*; *dur* = *tuš* = *a š â b u*, 'dwell,' and *duru* = *dusu* = *a g a l u*, 'calf.' Note also *asakku* = *a š a k k u* and *asaru* probably = *a š a r u*.

The disappearance of internal *-m-*, as *umuš* = *uš*, 'understanding'; *dumu* = *du*, 'child' (p. 18), was, of course, due to the *w*-pronunciation of *m*, perhaps like the nasal *mh* of the modern Gaelic, where *mh* = *n̥w*; Gaelic *lamh*, 'hand,' pronounced *ullán̥w*. A similar elision of a consonant is that of the "qâf nuqtetên" in modern Arabic vernacular.

Delitzsch considers (§ 25) that the nasal *n* = *ng* has an important bearing on the character of the so-called Eme-sal "dialect." The *ng* pronunciation of *-m-* which appears in ES: *dimer*; EK: *dingir*, 'god,' is an illustration of this phenomenon. Delitzsch believes that *m* corresponding to *w* and to *g* = *ng* ran as parallel pronunciations and that, therefore, these are not distinctions between two "dialects," because both *m* = *m*, *w* and *=g* = *ng* occur indiscriminately in both EK and ES texts throughout the entire literature. On the other hand, if these *m* and *g* writings indicated different pronunciations, as seems evident, and were not mere graphic distinctions for

the same pronunciation, which Delitzsch does not assert, they were then really phonetic or "dialectic" differentiations, although possibly not restricted, as he asserts, to EK or to ES texts. It seems futile to suppose with Delitzsch (p. 22) that the well-known variations between EK: *ner* and ES: *šer* ($n = š$) were not genuine sound changes between cognate roots, but in reality ancient and distinct synonymous roots. He bases this theory on the fact that the variants *m-g* and *n-š* are not confined to one dialect. He apparently does not know that the correspondence of *n* to a sibilant is an actual phonetic change between the modern Chinese dialects; cf. Pekingese: *žen*; Hakka: *nyin*; Fuchow: *nöng*; Ningpo: *žing* and *nying*, both within the same dialect; Wöndchow: *zang* and *nang*, all meaning 'man.' Also Pekingese: *jih*; Ningpo: *jeh* and *nyih* within the same dialect = 'sun' (cf. H. A. Giles, *Chinese and English Dictionary*, numbers 5624 and 579 respectively). This demonstrates beyond a doubt the possibility of a strongly palatalized *n* becoming a palatalized sibilant, and vice versa. There is only a very slight tongue movement between these two pronunciations (*MSL*, p. xii).

Delitzsch does not believe that the five Eme's, viz., *Eme-gal* (his reading for *Eme-sal*, for which see just below), *Eme-sukud-da*, *Eme-suš-a*, *Eme-te-na*, and *Eme-si-di*, are really linguistic distinctions, but denote rather stylistic differences (see, however, Langdon's readings of these terms, commented on by me *AJSL*, XXVIII, 67-68). I make no attempt to explain the meaning of these designations save to point out that Delitzsch's identification of *Eme-te-na* with *Eme-sal* I have already indicated (*AJSL*, XXVIII, 68) and have translated *Eme-te-na*, 'language of the couch' or 'harem,' i.e., 'women's apartments.' Delitzsch, however, does not believe that *sal* means 'woman' at all (p. 21, n. 1), the usual word for which is *geme* or *ki-el*. It must be noted that the woman-sign, a conventionalized picture of the female organ, has the value *sa-al*, Br. 10916 (rarer *ša-al*, Br. 10917). This surely must have been a word for 'woman,' as we find the equation *sal* = *zinništu*, 'woman,' and *rapāšu*, 'be wide, broad,' an allusion to the womb. There is a word *sil* = 'split,' which must also be a cognate of this *sal* and allude to the *pudendum muliebre*. See even Delitzsch, *Glossar*, s.v. *sal* I. It is true that the woman-sign also has the value *gal*, Br. 10906, which Delitzsch has chosen in

his reading *Eme-gal*. This *Eme-gal* (= *ga-al*) is really the *gal* = *r a b û*, 'large,' and also indicates 'the female organ; cf. *ga-al-la*, II. 30, 14 e = *uru*, 'the *pudendum muliebre*'; *ki-el*, 'woman,' is probably also connected with this *gal*. I see no reason to depart from my interpretation (*MSL*, p. xiv) that *Eme-sal* = 'women's speech' or 'softer idiom.' The fact that ES words occur in EK texts and conversely does not necessarily militate against the theory that the expressions *Eme-ku* and *Eme-sal* indicate two different phonetic methods of pronouncing Sumerian, which could readily have been confused one with the other, even from the earliest times. In later Sumerian, as the phonetic character of the language lost its force, *Eme-ku* and *Eme-sal* probably really meant only two distinct "styles."

In his discussion of the Pronouns (p. 24), Delitzsch does not explain the equations *ku* = *a n â k u*, 'I'; *li* = *a t t a*, 'thou'; *še* = *š û*, 'he,' and *ši* = *š u a t u m*, 'that one.' The *ku* here was probably a variant writing for *mu* the 1 p. ending = *gu* = *ku*; note that in the later Semitic representations of Sumerian words in the *Sumerisch-Akkadische Hettitische Vokabularfragmente*¹ by Delitzsch, *k* was constantly used for *g* as *gi-gi* = *ki-ki*; *i-gi* = *i-ki*, etc. The fact that *gu-mu* was probably originally a nasal *g* = *ng* does not hinder this explanation, as the earlier nasal *g* = *ng* may have later become hard *g* and in Semitic *k*. The equation *li* = *a t t a* is, no doubt, only the demonstrative *li* = *š u a t u* (cf. Langdon, § 164) especially applied to the second person in the passage cited, V R, 20, n. 4. The equations *še* = *š u* and *ši* = *š u a t u m* may be ES forms for the harder demonstrative forms *ne* and *ni* respectively (*n* = *š*; see just above).

Delitzsch does not explain such passages as IV R, 27, n.1, 4-11, where we find a succession of *-mu*-clauses, all of them third person relative; cf. also *HT*, 122, 16 obv: *eri-zu-ka ag-gig-ga aka-mu* = *a n a ardiki ša maruštum epšu*, 'unto thy servant who makes (*ak-a-mu*) sickness' (is sick). This is probably a relative *mu*, distinct from the first personal *mu* (from *mê* 'I'); cf. *MSL*, p. xxix. This seems likely, unless we are to regard all these passages as errors on the part of the Semitic translator. In the passage (Delitzsch, p. 36, § 50): *mulu ugu-mu ze-eb-ba* = *ša ili ša t â b u*, 'that which is good for her,' Delitzsch renders 'for me.' Here, however, the *ša* might have been a scribal error for *ī a* = *ili ī a*. On p. 28, Delitzsch

¹ In the *Abhandlungen der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1914.

omits the second personal *rab* (probably = 2 p. *za* + *b*), but on p. 103 (near the top), he cites *mu-ra-du*, 'I have built for thee.' This *ra* = *za* by rhotacism.

Delitzsch divides the substantive (p. 41) into primary, i.e., monosyllabic roots, and secondary roots with formative elements, but the probability is that many of these so-called primary roots were themselves originally composites. Thus *i-zi*, 'fire,' cited by the author as a primary, really = *zi* = *namaru*, 'shine' + the abstract prefix *i-*. This *izi* must be carefully distinguished tonally from *izi*, 'wall,' from *GIŠ* = *iz* = 'wood,' associated with Sem. *i q u*.

Paul Haupt¹ was the first to point out the system of vowel prolongation explained by Delitzsch (§ 61).

In connection with the author's treatment of the genitive particles *-ka* and *-ge*, cf. Langdon, § 125: "when the genitive has the force of describing the construct . . . the construct ending *-ge* precedes the plural ending." Delitzsch brings out the same point; viz., the possibility of a postpositional insert occurring before another termination. This was explained fully by me in "Le Bouc Émissaire," *JA*, 1903, p. 146, and contradicted without reason by M. Fossey (*op. cit.*, n. 1) in the running commentary to my article which he caused to be inserted without my knowledge. That the ending *-ge* can also be used in the passive sense like the English 'by' is satisfactorily shown by Delitzsch, § 71 and § 216.

The author's treatment of the postpositions (pp. 52-58) is excellent. Here it should be noted that the element *ta* (§ 109a) also occurs as a prefix. The adverbial ending *-š* evidently connected with the postposition *-šu* = *KU* is modal after participles (§ 79). This *š*-element is, of course, not to be confused with the purely Semitic third personal *-š*, seen also in Sem. *š ū*, 'he.'

With the treatise on the pure prepositions (pp. 56-58), cf. also *HT*, Sumerian Grammar. I note that Delitzsch has found the reading *u-gu*, Sb. iv. 17 (p. 57), instead of the commonly accepted *muġ*, 'upon,' but *muġ*, 'cranium, top,' occurs in Sumerian, Sb. 1, iv. 39 (*Glossar*, p. 193). Is this *muġ*, then, a Semitism, because in Syrian Arabic مخ is used for 'head,' or is this Arabic term a loan-word from Sumerian like هيكل?

¹ In Haupt, *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, grammatical appendix.

Delitzsch gives the Sumerian numerals (pp. 60-62) somewhat differently from Langdon (p. 117) and *MSL* (pp. xvii-xviii), as shown in the following comparative table:

| Delitzsch | Langdon | <i>MSL</i> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>aš, ge, diš, dili</i> | <i>aš</i> | <i>diš</i> |
| <i>min, man</i> | <i>min</i> | <i>man, min, dab, taš</i> |
| <i>eš</i> | <i>eššu</i> | <i>eš, iš</i> |
| <i>limmu</i> | <i>lammu</i> | <i>limmu</i> |
| <i>ia</i> | <i>ia</i> | <i>ia</i> |
| <i>aš</i> | <i>ašša</i> | <i>aš</i> |
| <i>umun, imin</i> | <i>imin</i> | <i>iminna</i> |
| <i>ussu</i> | <i>ussu</i> | <i>us</i> |
| <i>ilimmu</i> | <i>elimmu</i> | <i>ilim</i> |
| <i>u, ġa; a, ġa</i> | <i>u</i> | <i>u</i> |
| <i>neš, niš</i> | <i>niš</i> | <i>niš</i> |
| <i>ušu</i> | <i>ušu</i> | <i>ušu, eš, iš</i> |
| <i>nimin</i> | <i>nimin</i> | <i>nimin, nin</i> |
| <i>ninnu</i> | <i>ninnu</i> | <i>ninnu</i> |
| <i>geš, muš</i> | <i>giš, muš, uš</i> | <i>šuš</i> |

It is odd that he makes no attempt to explain some of them, either here or in the *Glossar*. This *aš*, 'six' = *iā* + *aš*, 'five + one' (see above); *imin*, 'seven' = *i* (*ai*), 'five' + *min*, 'two' (*umun* is a curious form indicating perhaps an obscure vowel in *imin*); *ussu*, 'eight' = *ia*, 'five' + *eš*, 'three'; *ilimmu*, 'nine' = *ia*, 'five' + *limmu*, 'four'; *ušu*, 'thirty' = *uš*, vowel harmony for *eš*, 'three' + *u*, 'ten' = 'three tens'; *nimin*, 'forty' = *ni(š)*, 'twenty' + *min*, 'two' = 'two twenties.'

The postposition *-am* (*A-AN*) for cardinals and (*k*)*am* for ordinals are really parts of the verb 'to be' (see § 199 b). The ending *am* is also frequently the verbal enclitic ending, like Turkish *dyr*, 'is.'

Is the copula really *u* in Sumerian and, if so, is it a Semitism? This *u* may be a loanword from the Semitic, as the usual method of expressing the copula in Sumerian is by adding the 3 p. *-bi* to the second noun of the series: *idigna buranunu-bi*, 'Tigris and Euphrates,' or else by simple asynthesis, as *an-ki*, 'heaven (and) earth' (§ 205).

The Sumerian negative *la* may also be a Semitism (p. 65), but it may possibly be a variant of the ordinary Sumerian *na* = *nu*, 'not' (§ 92, n. 2), as *n* = *l*.

I believe that *ge*, 'verily,' and *ge*=the optative particle (§ 93) must have been tonally distinct.

Delitzsch's treatment of the verb (pp. 69-140) is extremely lucid and better arranged than that in Langdon's *Grammar*. In Delitzsch's chapter on the simple root (pp. 69-73), he mentions the peculiarity of Sumerian in combining with an indicating verbal root another root in cognate relationship. This usage he divides, with more clearness than Langdon, into five categories; viz., (1) combinations with accusative meanings: *šu-gibil . . . ak*, 'make new'; (2) locative combinations: *ki . . . tum*, 'bring to earth'='lower'; (3) instrumental combinations: *šu . . . kud*, 'bite,' *šu* being the instrumental particle really='hand'; *gir . . . gen*, 'go with the foot' (*gir*); (4) modal combinations: *ur . . . ku*, 'eat like a dog' (used of animals) eating=German 'fressen'; (5) substantive + postposition as the first element=*sag-ta . . . dug-ga*, 'act with the head'='gore with horns.' Modern Turkish shows exactly the same phenomenon: *imtiḥân etmek*, 'make examination'; *du. a etmek*, 'make prayer,' etc., the difference being that Turkish almost always uses a loanword in combination with the native *etmek* 'make.' Besides this peculiarity, Delitzsch indicates the use of purely verbal particles, *da*, *ši*, *ta*, *bara*, which are used like the Latin particles in *ad-esse*, *con-jicere*, *ex-ire*, etc. He might have also drawn a parallel from Magyar, as *ki-ismerni*, 'find out'; *ki* 'out' and *ismer*, 'perceive,' although this may be an imitation of German usage, as 'ausfinden.'

It is stated (p. 72 a) that the *n* and *b* suffixes appended to verbal particles, as *dan*, *dab*, etc., do not affect the meaning of the particle. He admits, however, that these suffixes *n* and *b* are of pronominal origin respectively corresponding to *nî* and *bî*, but argues that their purely pronominal sense had disappeared in the Sumerian idiom as we have it. This is certainly an easy method of explaining away the difficulty of interpreting the suffixes *n* and *b*!

Delitzsch's remarks (§§ 114-17) on the use of the simple root are particularly good. The fact that the root alone can be used both in neuter and active verbs is especially significant in connection with the tone theory (see above in this review). The simple root is also used both for the infinitive and imperative. Especial attention

should be paid by the student to § 120 on the infinitive in *-da*, *-de*, which function in almost the same manner as the infinitive 'to' in English. There is also a participle in *-da*, *-de* (§ 124) which is with difficulty distinguishable from the infinitive. The last word has certainly not been said on this subject. In any case, the participial formation is very close to the infinitive; cf. *mu-bad-da*=la patê, 'not opening' and also 'not to open.'

The reflexive *-ni* in a verb-form occurs as a reference to an immediately preceding object, as *u-me-ni-si*, 'give (it),' and is very suggestive of the Ural-Altaic definite conjugation, as Magyar: szeretem, 'I love him,' or 'it,' used with defined nouns, but szeretek, 'I love him,' 'it,' indefinite.

It is significant and interesting that Delitzsch sees no difference in meaning between the verbal prefixes of the third person: *e*, *eme*, *ema*; *ne*, *ni*; *ba*, *bi*; *mu*, *ma* and *nen*; *bab*, *ban*; *mun*, *man*, *mib*, etc., all of which, according to the author, mean simply 'he, she, it.' He entirely disregards the apparent local force of some of these prefixes which was admitted by Langdon (*Grammar*, § 163) and pointed out by me (*AJSL*, XXIV, 354-65). This again seems like cutting the Gordian knot. Further investigation of Sumerian syntax will probably show: (1) that the differences in vowels of such prefixes as *ne*, *ni*; *ba*, *bi*; *mu*, *ma* (*mi*); *in*, *an*; *ib*, *ab*, *ub*; *im*, *um*, *am* were due to an obscurity of vocalic utterance (cf. above); and (2), that there were, at least originally, different shades of meaning expressed by the *b*-series (*ab*, *ib*, *ub*, etc.) and the *m*, *n*-series (*im*, *in*, etc.) respectively. As to the subject prefixes of the second person (§ 150), there are none in evidence save *zu*-. *zu-ši BIT-e*=naplis 'look,' IV R, 9, 21, 27b. As already pointed out in *MSL*, p. xxxi, the second person was indicated by the ordinary prefixes which referred back to a *za-e* (*ze*), 'thou,' or else to a second personal suffix *-zu* in a preceding phrase. If *mu*, *ma*, *mi*, *im* (§ 151) indicate specifically the first person, they must have been used with a different tone from that of the *m*-series of the third person.

Vowel harmony, not mentioned by Delitzsch, must have influenced the precatives *ġe*-, *ġa*-, *ġu*- (§ 152), as we find *ġe-gub*; *ġe-pa*, probably pronounced *güb* and *pä*, and *ġe-i-i*, but *ġa-ba*; *ġa-ba-an*; *ġa-ma*- and *ġu-mu*-, clearly caused by vowel harmony. This *ġa*

must be distinguished from the cohortative *ga* in *ga-gar*, 'I will do it' (§ 157).

Delitzsch recognizes a number of infixes with a dative meaning (pp. 111-19), not distinguishing between *na*, *nan* and *nab*, 'to him,' or between *ne* and *nen* (also accusative), 'to them.' In *AJSL*, XXIV, 356, I called attention to the evidently dative force of the a-vowel appearing also in *ra*, *rab*, 'to thee.'

Delitzsch's accusative infixes (pp. 119-24) are *ni*, *nin*, *nib*, 'him' (without distinction); *nen*, 'them.' His infixes with both dative and accusative force are *na-ni*, *na-nib*, 'it to him'; *ra-nin*, *ranib*, 'it to thee.'

His root complements (pp. 125-32) are *da*, *dan*, *dab*, 'with it' = direction; *ši*, *šin*, *šib*, purely directive, long ago recognized; *ta*, *tan*, *tab* = locative 'in' and 'out of' with verb of motion; *bara*, *baran*, 'out of, away' (discussed above).

If Langdon is perhaps too much of a stickler for shades of meaning in connection with the prefixes and infixes, it would seem that Delitzsch has not gone quite far enough, as it is impossible to believe that a language could have employed whole series of different elements in exactly the same sense; in fact, this was one of Halévy's grounds for supposing that Sumerian was not a language, but an "allographic" system!

Delitzsch's last pages (pp. 141-54) are devoted to a too brief treatise on the syntax. It is not a unique phenomenon, as the author seems to think (§ 202), to find the singular pronominal suffixes used for the plural, as *a-zu* = 'thy father' and also 'your father.' An exact parallel exists in the Tule Indian language of Panamá, which uses *pe*- both for 'thou' and 'you' (Prince, *American Anthropologist*, N.S. XV, 519).

A very important fact brought out by Delitzsch (§ 214) is the construction of verbs used causatively with the dative suffix *-ra*, *-šu* (*KU*), as *še-en-na-an-ti*, 'may he cause to him (*nan*) to live.' The insertion of the 'with'-element *-da-* (p. 148) into a verb-form is precisely paralleled in Algonquin Indian phraseology, as Passamaquoddy *wijawi*, 'come with me' (*wi-*, 'with'). Sumerian relative sentences with the relative idea expressed participially are like the relative clauses in Turkish; thus, Sumerian: *lu nam-erima ku-ne-*

in-lal-e, 'a man by a curse afflicted' = Turkish: *görlmish olan adam*, 'the having-been-seen man.'

I have merely touched the surface of Delitzsch's great undertaking, picking out data here and there which impress the philologist. The distinguished author's vast knowledge and immense mass of material have been freely placed at the disposal of the Assyriological world in this epoch-making work, and the book must long remain a monument to his wonderful and painstaking scholarship.